



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,495	11/25/2003	Michael Kenny	54008.8100.US01	6048

45540 7590 12/16/2005
PERKINS COIE LLP/SEMITOOL
PO BOX 1208
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1208

EXAMINER

STINSON, FRANKIE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1746

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/721,495

Applicant(s)

KENNY ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-11,14,15 and 22-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date VARIOUS.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1746

1. In view of the cancellation of apparatus claims 16-21, the Restriction Requirement of September 21, 2005 is hereby vacated.

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 22, 23, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Lampert et al., (U. S. Pat. No. 5,181,985).

Re claims 1 and 22 for example, note that Lampert discloses a method of cleaning a single workpiece comprising;

placing a single workpiece into a process chamber (col. 3, lines 62-63);

closing the chamber (col. 4, lines 4-7, "conventional" spray or etching cleaning chamber are closed off due the to harmful chemicals used);

heating a liquid (col. 2, lines 33-39);

spinning the workpiece (col. 6, line 8);

spraying the spinning workpiece with the heated

liquid, with the heated liquid forming a layer on the workpiece (col. 2, lines 40-51, "water mist is built up"); and

providing ozone gas into the process chamber (col. 2, lines 52-56), with the ozone gas dissolved into the liquid, or injected into the liquid, causing portions of the ozone gas to dissolve into the liquid, and other portions of the ozone gas to be entrained into the

Art Unit: 1746

liquid, and with the ozone gas chemically reacting with a contaminant on the workpiece (col. 2, lines 50-51) to clean the workpiece. In regard to claim 8, note Lampert, col. 3, line 65-67.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampert et al. in view of either Tanaka et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,158,100) or Wen U. S. Pat. No. 6,239,038).

Claim 5 defines over Lampert only in the recitation of the process chamber being heated to indirectly heat the workpiece. Tanaka and Wen are each cited disclosing a workpiece treating system/method employing ozone, where there is provided chamber heating means (see col. 19, lines 32-14 and fig. 14, reference character 264 in Tanaka, and see col. 8, lines 51-55 and fig. 23, reference character 521 in Wen) for indirectly heating the workpiece. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Lampert, to have the chamber heated as taught by either Tanaka or Wen, for the purpose of enhancing the cleaning process. Re claim 6, note that Wen discloses the down facing workpiece (fig. 21).

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampert et al. in view of either Kashiwase et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,378,317) or DeGendt et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 6,551,409).

Art Unit: 1746

Claim 9 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the injection of ozone into the liquid and delivering the same into the chamber. Kashiwase and DeGendt are each cited disclosing in a method for cleaning a workpiece, where there is ozone combined with a liquid and the same is provided to the chamber. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Lampert, to include a ozone/liquid provided to the chamber as taught by either Kashiwase or DeGendt, since Kashiwase and DeGendt, disclose the use of either an ozone gas or an ozonated liquid.

6. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampert et al. in view of Rose et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,967,156).

Claim 14 defines over Lampert only in the recitation of the liquid layer being formed by a pulsed spray. Rose discloses a workpiece method employing ozone, where the liquid is pulsed (col. 3, line 49). It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Lampert, to have the liquid pulsed as taught by Rose, for the purpose of enhancing the cleaning process.

7. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampert et al. in view of either Koizumi et al. (U. S. Pat. 5,503,708) or Japan'732 (Japan 63-110732).

Re claim 26, Lampert is cited disclosing as applied in paragraph 2 above, essentially disclosing all of the claimed subject matter with the exception of the application of steam. Koizumi and Japan'732 are each cited disclosing a workpiece treating method employing ozone, where steam is also directed to the workpiece. It therefore would

Art Unit: 1746

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the process of Lampert, to include steam as taught by either Koizumi or Japan'732, for the purpose of enhancing the cleaning process.

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In Japan'827, Oikari et al., Uziel et al. and Yoneda, note the cleaning method.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 1746

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls



FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1746